

CIA HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM
RELEASE AS SANITIZED

2003

~~SECRET~~

PP/P-8623

Executive Registry
5-1913
Revised by
2/7/54 dt

1 February 1954

MEMORANDUM FOR: DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

SUBJECT : Statement by Prominent Democrat on Expropriation
in Central America

1. You will recall that in the recent discussion with an American Ambassador to a Central American country, it was thought desirable to have a prominent Democrat make a public statement— *See Attached* touching on the threatened expropriation of certain American investments in that country. It was hoped that such a statement might persuade the head of the government of that country that our Ambassador's position is not simply the expression of the Republican Party and the Republican Administration (which the head of the government apparently believes will not obtain after the next election), but is truly a bipartisan view and not likely to be affected by election results.

2. Acting upon your request to proceed in this matter, a proposed statement was drafted by us and redrafted by State, which is attached hereto. Please note the Guatemala "angle".

3. Further, a prominent Democratic Senator has agreed to deliver the proposed statement on the floor of the Senate quite soon. Colonel J. C. King has been asked to monitor the Congressional Record for the statement and, when it is made, to see that it gets the news circulation desired, as well as informing our Ambassadors to both Central American countries concerned, so that they can make independent use of it.

4. While this undertaking might have been more properly handled by State, we have done it as a favor to the Ambassador, with the concurrence of State as to the idea for such a statement and its content.

[]
FRANK G. WISNER
Deputy Director (Plans)

Attachment

~~SECRET~~

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

1/28/54

THE UNDER SECRETARY

Jake: We feel that the
attached is less pointed
at the country concerned
and will accomplish the
same purpose.
Dick

7

The report of the Randall Commission has underlined very sharply the prominent part which must be played by American foreign investments in extending to other less developed countries the capital outlays, modern machinery and technical skills that are indispensable for their economic betterment. This goal is truly bipartisan, on which both major parties are in substantial agreement, as is clearly demonstrated by the fact that various of the programs and measures to stimulate foreign investments set up under the administration of President Truman have been actively aided and pushed under the administration of President Eisenhower.

In this hemisphere, American investors have made significant contributions to the economies of other countries. With courage and foresight they have spurred the development of mineral resources, petroleum deposits, agricultural enterprises, air and surface communications networks and centers of commercial trading and financial exchange. We believe, on both sides of the aisle, that these investments have been beneficial not only to the American investors but to an equal if not larger degree to the peoples of the countries to the south. But we must recognize that they have had to cope with special problems, ranging from minor discriminations to outright confiscation. If the program so well sponsored to date is to succeed in bringing its solid benefits to other countries, it must enjoy the firm and decisive

support

support of all branches of our Government and all shades of political opinion.

Let there be no doubt that it has such support. We have observed recently the betterment of relations with Argentina, which makes possible the renewed interest of American capital in that country, on the proper basis of respect for its laws and the proud history of a progressive people. At the same time, we must observe with real concern the harassment and outright attack on American investments by the Communist-influenced Government of Guatemala, which has so unwisely permitted a program of social reform to be dominated by the agents of Moscow, whose primary objective is always the elimination of friendly American private enterprise. Of special interest to me has been the course followed by the Government of Costa Rica and the United Fruit Company, the largest American enterprise in that country, in seeking an orderly and agreeable solution for differences between them. I have observed that in the preliminary letters exchanged between Don José Figueres, President of Costa Rica, and the United Fruit Company, both sides have emphasized respect for the sanctity of existing contracts, to which amendments can properly be made only by mutual agreement - while at the same time each recognizes the rights and responsibilities of the other in making such amendments as will eliminate any inequities and misunderstandings between them. This should be a model course for solution of difficulties, and I may say that it should be regarded as the ^{all-} American way of doing things, which

is the way based on our traditional respect for law and agreement as the very basis of relations between individuals and nations, while at the same time keeping before our minds the wisdom of mutual accommodation to changing needs and conditions. It is the opposite to the method of threat and intimidation which is the characteristic note of totalitarian systems, so unhappily imitated by the Government of Guatemala in its dealings with American business.

its own private enterprise.

paramount to the Constitution of the United States."

No one is making such a contention except the proponents of the amendment, who contend that it is necessary to pass the amendment to put to rest the contention which they themselves have made.

The Senator from Maryland also stated that, if the amendment were adopted—

In some instances, such as the ownership of property by aliens within the United States, it might be necessary to have—indeed, it would be necessary to have—an act of the State legislature to authorize such ownership.

The very next day, the Senator from Ohio declared that—

Congress has plenary power over the rights and privileges of aliens in the United States.

MISSOURI AGAINST HOLLAND

Mr. President, the proponents of the Bricker amendment place great reliance upon the case of Missouri against Holland. That case was decided in 1920, and the Senator from Maryland found in it last Wednesday what he described as "two new and somewhat startling doctrines." Yet in all the years since 1920, an entire generation of Americans managed to live with Missouri against Holland, through the most turbulent foreign relations of our history, and until very recently none of them felt at all threatened by it.

The Senator from Ohio, indeed, said on Thursday that he agrees with the result of the decision in Missouri against Holland. But he disagrees with the reasoning by which it was reached. It should have been based, he said, not on the treaty involved but on the commerce clause of the Constitution.

On other occasions, as I recall, the Senator has also pointed to the commerce clause as a means of mitigating some of the consequences which would flow from his amendment.

This is, strangely, inconsistent, Mr. President. The effect of the amendment would be to restrict the power of the Federal Government to make and implement treaties. But the expansion of the commerce clause which the Senator from Ohio suggests could be far more dangerous to States rights than the expansion of the treaty power which he fears.

There are some, and I know that the Senator from Ohio is not one of them—and I am not either—who hold the view that there is no such thing as intrastate commerce any more, that all commerce is interstate commerce. If that view ever prevails, the 10th amendment and States rights will be as extinct as a dinosaur. But I do not hear anyone advocating a limitation on the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce for that reason.

I do point out, however, that to the extent the Bricker amendment leads to an expansion of the commerce clause, to that extent it will be hastening the complete dominance of the Federal Government over all aspects of our domestic affairs.

Mr. President, I have a few words with reference to executive agreements. I think there is a good deal of misunder-

standing regarding executive agreements. They fall into four classes, as we all know. There is a class which comes under the Constitution, which gives the President power to receive ambassadors, and so forth. That is a constitutional provision.

There are executive agreements with respect to which the President must exercise his power as Commander in Chief.

There is a classification according to which the President, under authorization of the Congress, fulfills certain legislative pronouncements.

There is, of course, a fourth class, under which the President, after a treaty is made, must make a number of executive agreements.

When we consider the large field in which the President deals in relation to the affairs of 160 million persons, we begin to understand what we are involved in when we attempt to take some authority from the President and even limit the authority of the Senate and pass some of it over to the other branch of the Congress.

EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

There is also a curious contradiction in the argument of the Senator from Ohio for section 3 of his amendment, which has to do with regulation of executive agreements by Congress.

He said:

The amendment does not say that Congress must regulate or approve all executive agreements; it merely recognizes in Congress power to do so, which may, in fact, never be exercised; if exercised, it must be assumed that Congress will exercise reasonable judgment for the welfare of the country, as it does in all other matters.

Why, then, Mr. President, can it not also be assumed that the Senate will exercise reasonable judgment in regard to treaties? The Senator from Ohio himself said that Congress exercised reasonable judgment in all other matters, which include treaties. I simply cannot understand what he is afraid of.

Mr. President, the only sure guaranty that there will be no unwise treaties is to make it impossible to conclude any treaties at all. By making it more difficult to conclude treaties, the Bricker amendment would simply make it more difficult to conclude good treaties as well as bad ones.

The proponents of the amendment make a great point of the provision in article VI of the Constitution that treaties are the supreme law of the land. That same article also says that acts of Congress are the supreme law of the land.

UNWISE CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Acts of Congress can be very unwise and still be within the constitutionally delegated powers of Congress. Hundreds of ill-advised bills are introduced every year, and sometimes some of them pass, but I have not heard anyone advocating a constitutional amendment to limit the powers of Congress because of that fact. Yet as soon as an ill-advised treaty is suggested in the United Nations, a great hue and cry goes up that we must amend the Constitution to guard ourselves against it.

So horrendous are the fears conjured up by the proponents of the Bricker amendment that I sometimes get the feeling of being with Alice in Wonderland. Indeed, Mr. President, the other day I read Alice in Wonderland again and got the feeling of being in the United States Senate.

The proponents of the Bricker amendment remind me of the queen in the following passage:

"I can't believe that," said Alice.

"Can't you?" the queen said in a pitying tone. "Try again: draw a long breath, and shut your eyes."

Alice laughed. "There's no use trying," she said: "one can't believe impossible things."

"I daresay you haven't had much practice," said the queen. "When I was your age, I always did it for half an hour a day. Why sometimes I've believed as many as six impossible things before breakfast."

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. President, on last Thursday, after noting some of the inaccurate statements being made by proponents of the Bricker amendment and that they are indirectly attacking the motives and judgment of the President, I asked if the time had not come for us "to look more closely at those who demand that we take the Constitution apart and redistribute its powers." I asked, "What do they really want?"

I got my answer sooner than I expected. That very afternoon the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] made it unmistakably clear that he is not as worried about the Constitution as he is worried about American membership in the United Nations.

He made this statement, and I quote:

A ratified treaty confers on Congress unlimited power to legislate on the subject matter of the treaty. . . . The charter of the United Nations is a ratified and approved treaty. Articles 65 and 66 of that treaty have conferred on Congress the unlimited power to legislate on the subject of civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights.

Well, I am thankful that the courts of this country are not likely to rely on this interpretation of the charter and the authority it allegedly given to Congress. I certainly could not support the United Nations if it had the effect that the Senator from Nevada fears.

Fortunately we have some other competent people who have expressed themselves on the impact of the United Nations Charter on our Constitution.

Let us take a look at what the report to the President had to say on this point when the charter was before the Senate for approval. Referring to article 55 of the charter, the report noted that this article, and I quote, "pledges the various countries to cooperate with the organization in the achievement of the economic and social objectives of the organization without infringing upon their right to order their national affairs according to their own best ability, in their own way, and in accordance with their own political and economic institutions and processes." Further on, the report notes that the charter "safeguards the right of nations to live their own lives free from unwarranted interference."

Does this sound like the United Nations Charter is a diabolical instrument, to turn America over to foreigners, as many supporters of the Bricker amendment claim?

Mr. President, when Secretary of State Stettinius appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to support the United Nations Charter, he said:

The organization . . . is not authorized to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State. (See art. 2, par. 7, U. N. Charter.)

Does this sound like supergovernment?

Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Ohio have made much of the case of Sei Fujii against California. The Supreme Court of California in that case made it absolutely clear that it rejected any suggestion that the Charter of the United Nations operates to overthrow domestic law. It approved specifically the language I quoted earlier to the effect that national affairs continue to be controlled in accordance with each nation's own political and economic institutions and processes.

The court added:

We are satisfied that the charter provisions relied on by the plaintiff, were not intended to supersede existing domestic legislation.

Mr. President, what is happening in connection with our discussion of the Bricker amendment is that forces who oppose the United Nations, forces who want America to retire behind an ocean curtain, people who say "get the United States out of the U. N. and the U. N. out of the United States," are drawing together to back the Bricker amendment. They see that device as a way to cripple the United States in the conduct of its foreign affairs. They see it as a device to put the United States in the back seat instead of keeping the United States in a position of world leadership.

Day by day it becomes clearer that we are fighting forces that seek to turn back the clock. The effect of what they want to do would be to surrender the United Nations to the Russians by getting the United States out of the U. N. The senior Senator from Ohio said as long ago as May 1952, "the United Nations seems destined for an early demise—it is suffering from a disease which affects every bureaucracy, an unsatiable lust for power." Mr. President, it is not the United Nations that lusts for power. Rather the Soviet Union in its lust for power seeks in the U. N. and elsewhere to woo the nations of the world away from the paths of freedom.

Well, I have had enough of pulling out of areas where we are face to face with Russia. I am willing to pit our free way of life against the Soviet way of life in the arena of the United Nations. We have not done so badly in daily U. N. debate. Ambassador Lodge is slugging it out with the Russians day after day in the United Nations. Time after time he gets 55 nations to line up with the United States in opposition to Communist proposals put before the U. N. Is this a time for a move that would weaken our leadership in the U. N. and in the world? Is this a time for us to disen-

gage ourselves from the U. N. cold-war arena—leaving a gigantic stage for the Communist tragedy to play before the world?

Ambassador Lodge said recently in New York:

There is not anything in the United Nations Charter that makes it necessary to amend the Constitution.

"The Soviet Union," he said, "has a bear by the tail." It cannot destroy or control the U. N. and it does not dare to leave the U. N.

I do not think the American people will be behind any plan that would directly or indirectly wreck the U. N. That is what some of the Bricker proponents want—but not what the people want. In fact, a recent poll conducted by Mr. Elmo Roper indicates that 35 percent of the American people want to strengthen the U. N. Another 21 percent believe we should work along with the United Nations pretty much as it exists. And another 17 percent want to work toward creating an organization stronger than the present United Nations. In other words, some 73 percent of the American people—and that includes the great Middle West—go along with President Eisenhower in believing that the United States must continue to work with other peoples through existing international organizations or better international organizations.

President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message had this to say about the United Nations:

It has given uniquely valuable services in many places where violence threatened. It is the only real world forum where we have the opportunity for international presentation and rebuttal. It is the place where the nations of the world can, if they have the will, take collective action for peace and justice. It is a place where guilt can be squarely assigned to those who fail to take all necessary steps to keep the peace.

Mr. President, I do not think the President of the United States would be a strong supporter of the United Nations if it were as dangerous as many of the Bricker amendment proponents seem to believe it to be. He strongly supports that organization because he believes it serves American interests to participate in it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

PROPAGANDA ATTACK BY GUATEMALA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on last Friday, according to the press, the Government of Guatemala launched another vicious propaganda attack upon the United States and some of its citizens. Apparently the Communist-dominated Government of Guatemala is preparing a propaganda background for further confiscation of private American investments and also preparing to launch an all-out effort to destroy the effectiveness of the Inter-American Conference scheduled for March 1.

Mr. President, it is very discouraging that in spite of our efforts to be reasonable and patient with our smaller neighbors to the south, Guatemala should persist in its antagonistic policies. This is especially regrettable in

view of the report of the Randall Commission. As everyone knows, I am deeply interested in freer trade among all nations; and as a background for trade I have always favored more investment abroad by private capital. I know that such investment can be mutually beneficial as it has proved to be on so many occasions.

Mr. President, the report of the Randall Commission has underlined very sharply the prominent part which must be played by American foreign investments in extending to other less developed countries the capital outlays, modern machinery, and technical skills that are indispensable for their economic betterment. This goal is truly bipartisan, one on which both major parties are in substantial agreement, as is clearly demonstrated by the fact that various of the programs and measures to stimulate foreign investments set up under the administration of President Truman have been actively aided and pushed under the administration of President Eisenhower.

In this hemisphere, American investors have made significant contributions to the economies of other countries. With courage and foresight they have spurred the development of mineral resources, petroleum deposits, agricultural enterprises, air and surface communications networks, and centers of commercial trading and financial exchange. We believe, on both sides of the aisle, that these investments have been beneficial not only to the American investors, but to an equal, if not larger, degree to the peoples of the countries to the south. But we must recognize that they have had to cope with special problems, ranging from minor discriminations to outright confiscation. If the program so well sponsored to date is to succeed in bringing its solid benefits to other countries, it must enjoy the firm and decisive support of all branches of our Government and all shades of political opinion.

Let there be no doubt that it has such support. We have observed recently the betterment of relations with Argentina, which makes possible the renewed interest of American capital in that country. At the same time, we must observe with real concern the harassment and outright attack on American investments by the Communist-influenced government of Guatemala, which has so unwisely permitted a program of social reform to be dominated by the agents of Moscow, whose primary objective is always the elimination of friendly American private enterprise. Of special interest to me has been the course followed by the government of Costa Rica and the United Fruit Co., the largest American enterprise in that country, in seeking an orderly and agreeable solution for differences between them. I have observed that in the preliminary letters exchanged between Don José Figueres, President of Costa Rica, and the United Fruit Co., both sides have emphasized respect for the sanctity of existing contracts, to which amendments can properly be made only by mutual agreement, while at the same time each recognizes the rights and responsibilities of the other in making such amendments.

as will eliminate any inequities and misunderstandings between them. This should be a model course for solution of difficulties, and I may say that it should be regarded as the all-American way of doing things, which is the way based on our traditional respect for law and agreement as the very basis of relations between individuals and nations, while at the same time keeping before our minds the wisdom of mutual accommodations to changing needs and conditions. It is the opposite to the method of threat and intimidation which is the characteristic note of totalitarian systems, so unhappily imitated by the government of Guatemala in its dealings with American business, to say nothing of its own private enterprise.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an Associated Press dispatch from Guatemala, dated January 29, entitled "United States Denies Backing Plot in Guatemala."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DENIES BACKING PLOT IN GUATEMALA

GUATEMALA, January 29.—Guatemala's presidency charged today that the United States was supporting a plot by four Latin American countries to invade Guatemala.

A statement from the office of President Jacobo Arbenz Guzman said seized documents showed that planes with napalm bombs and infantry with heavy arms were to be used.

It named Nicaragua, El Salvador, the Dominican Republic, and Venezuela as the four countries implicated.

Ringleaders of the plot were listed as Gen. Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes and Col. Carlos Castillo Armas, Guatemalan exiles.

The statement said its information came chiefly from intercepted correspondence.

Security officials said early this week that an antigovernment plot had been broken by a number of arrests, but refused further information.

The official statement came less than 24 hours after Victor Manuel Gutierrez, Secretary General of Guatemala's pro-Communist General Confederation of Labor, accused the American-owned United Fruit Co. of fostering an armed plot against the Guatemala Government.

United Fruit has constantly been under attack by Arbenz' leftist regime. The company's once large land areas have been reduced greatly through expropriation and redistribution.

The presidential office said one intercepted letter stated that the plans have the acquiescence of the government of the north (United States).

In Washington, a State Department spokesman called the charges ridiculous and untrue. He said the administration, from the moment of President Eisenhower's inaugural address, had made it perfectly clear that we would not intervene in any other nation's internal affairs.

This is additional proof, if proof is needed, of the length to which the international Communist conspiracy will go to break up hemisphere solidarity on the eve of the tenth inter-American conference.

The conference will meet in Caracas, Venezuela, March 1.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish, very briefly, to commend the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for his very fine discussion of the subject matter of the Bricker amendment. The Senator from Illinois has demonstrated on his part an excellent knowledge of many of the major points involved. His address also reflects his close study of the question as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. I do not know that I agree with all his statements, but certainly I heartily agree with some of the very excellent points he has made.

I wish the Senator from Illinois had discussed at greater length the subject of executive agreements, and had told us when an executive agreement leaves the line of being an executive agreement and becomes a treaty. Of course, I understand there is a formality to a treaty, but what is the proper subject matter of a treaty as compared with an executive agreement? I wish the Senator from Illinois had developed a little further his thinking along that line.

At any rate, I believe the Senator from Illinois has rendered a very fine service to the Senate in documenting and presenting specific instances and illustrations of a great number of questions that give deep concern to a number of Members of the Senate and to a great many people in the United States.

After the Senator from Illinois had left the Chamber, while he was not criticized personally, nevertheless some of his points were questioned rather sharply, particularly the expression he used about turning the Constitution over to lunatics. I do not suppose those expressions were intended to apply to his use of the term, but, at the same time, I believe something should be said to offset it.

I commend the Senator from Illinois sincerely for his excellent address.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am simply curious. I wonder if the Senator from Mississippi would indicate which of the examples cited by the Senator from Illinois really give him concern. It is a matter of interest to me as to which of the various examples cited by the proponents of the amendment really concern the Senator from Mississippi, or which of them really cause him difficulty in sleeping at night.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe the Senator from Arkansas heard the speech of the Senator from Illinois, did he not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I heard a great deal of it. I may say that some of the

suggested proposals give me no concern whatsoever, so long as the United States Senate continues to function. I still have faith that at least one-third plus one, if not more—I merely say a minimum of one-third—of the Members of the Senate have sufficient intelligence, I presume, to prevent the ratification of such proposals.

I cannot understand how anyone could have such a low estimate or such a low opinion of the intelligence of the Senate as to be greatly concerned that any of the examples cited by the Senator from Illinois would be adopted as treaties. That is really the point that bothers me. Why should any person suddenly have such a poor opinion of the discriminating intelligence of the Senate of the United States as to be concerned that the various proposals cited as being threats to the United States would be adopted?

I wonder if the Senator from Mississippi really is concerned that the Senate would be foolish enough to ratify treaties containing such proposals.

Mr. STENNIS. Since coming to the Senate, the Senator from Mississippi has been considerably disillusioned by the readiness with which very important, far-reaching treaties glide by the Senate with what I consider to be scant attention. However, I do not wish to enter into a discussion of that subject. I do not propose to discredit the body to which I have the honor to belong. I do not think there is any question of not having faith in any individual Member of the Senate, his integrity, or his intelligence. Neither is it a question of not having faith in any member of the executive branch of the Government, from the President down, or in not having faith in the members of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Thomas Jefferson said:

On questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.

I believe that is a very wise statement, applicable today in this great time of change. When Supreme Court precedents are brushed aside and ignored, as if they were scraps of paper, I think it is time for a reevaluation of a number of our principles.

Unless there were a check on the part of the Senate, at some time there might be an administration which would endeavor to enter into many agreements of the type referred to by the Senator from Illinois.

I hope the Senator from Arkansas will remain in the Senate for a long time, so that he may continue to be the good guardian that he is. I do not wish to extend the debate; I appreciate the fact that it is desired to have the Senate recess. I shall be glad to discuss the matter later with the Senator, if he wishes to do so.

Mr. SCHOEPPLE. Mr. President—

Mr. THYE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I sought to be recognized primarily for the purpose of commenting on the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I hold the Senator from Mississippi in the highest regard. I know of his sincerity and his great concern for the country. The only time I have ever known of a treaty's going through the Senate without a great deal of discussion was when it came to the Senate floor with a unanimous report from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Knowing that the Committee on Foreign Relations has within its membership some of the most able and distinguished senior Members of the Senate, when a treaty comes to the floor of the Senate with a unanimous agreement from the Committee on Foreign Relations, many of the Senators will accept the action of the committee, and will not raise a question as to what may be contained in the body of the treaty. I have been on the floor of the Senate when a treaty was approved under such circumstances. I merely desire to say that if a treaty was ratified in that manner it was because there was no objection.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator think that is a good practice?

Mr. THYE. No, the Senator from Minnesota does not think that is a good practice, and we have amended the procedure to make certain that a ye-and-nay vote will be taken. However, at the time such action took place, it was on the basis that the Committee on Foreign Relations had unanimously approved the treaty; therefore every Senator was willing to accept it on the recommendation of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I wish to comment to this extent so that those who read the Record will know that we are not so careless and negligent a legislative body as to permit a treaty to be ratified without raising any question in connection with it. The only reason why I ever acquiesced in action on treaties without ample debate was primarily because of the high regard in which the Committee on Foreign Relations has been held by me.

Both the Senator from Mississippi and I know that a Senator can become a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations only upon application because of seniority. We know that otherwise Senators take lesser assignments.

Mr. STENNIS. I may say for the Record that, of course, the Senator from Minnesota knows that I said nothing reflecting in any way upon the membership of the Committee on Foreign Relations; but the fact that the Senator from Minnesota himself suggested a change in the procedure and practice I think bears out my point.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. When the Senator from Kansas addressed the Chair a moment ago, if the Senator from Kansas understood correctly, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], occupying the majority leader's seat, asked for recognition, and the Chair informed the Senator that he had the floor.

Does the Senator from Kansas understand that the Senator from Minnesota, acting as majority leader, had the floor previous to the time the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] was addressing the Chair?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, perhaps I can be of assistance to the Senator from Kansas. I had raised a point, and desired to ask the Senator from Mississippi a question, and the Senator from Mississippi desired merely to complete his statement. I was standing on the floor, waiting for the Senator from Mississippi to complete his statement before I interrupted. However, if I interfered with the desire of the Senator from Kansas to get the floor, then I beg his pardon.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection to the Senator from Minnesota's occupying the majority leader's position. However, the Senator from Kansas addressed the Chair, the Chair recognized the Senator from Kansas, and the Senator from Kansas was then informed by the Chair that the Senator from Minnesota had the floor. I desire to apologize if when the Senator from Kansas asked for recognition if recognition had already been granted to the Senator from Minnesota. I desire to keep the Record straight regarding the

rules of the Senate, which are satisfactory to me. I wish to accord my colleagues every courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to advise the Senator from Kansas that the Chair erroneously recognized the Senator from Minnesota, who was in the majority leader's seat, the Chair presuming that the Senator from Minnesota was making a point as the majority leader. Nevertheless, the Senator from Kansas is entirely correct, and the Record should show it. The Chair should not have recognized the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I desire to say to the Chair and to the distinguished Senator that I had no objection to the Chair's recognizing the Senator as being the majority leader. However, the Senator from Kansas had thought that he was on his feet before the Senator occupying the majority leader's seat had risen and had been recognized. I did not want to interrupt if the Chair had previously recognized the Senator from Minnesota as having the right to the floor.

Mr. President, I had desired to make some remarks on the unfinished business, but I realize the hour is late, and I shall defer them until tomorrow.

RECESS

Mr. THYE. I move that the Senate now stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 2, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 1 (legislative day of January 22), 1954:

UNITED NATIONS

William A. Kimbel, of South Carolina, to be the representative of the United States of America to the ninth session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

GUATEMALA, GUATEMALA (AP)--THE GUATEMALAN CONGRESS VOTED TODAY TO PROTEST REMARKS BY SEN. ALEXANDER WILEY WHO AS CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE WAS ACCUSED OF WAGING "AN AGGRESSIVE CAMPAIGN AGAINST GUATEMALA'S DEMOCRATIC REGIME."

THE PROTEST WAS ADDRESSED TO THE U.S. SENATE WHICH RECENTLY HEARD WILEY DECLARE THAT COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF GUATEMALA'S GOVERNMENT CONSTITUTED A MENACE TO THE HEMISPHERE.

COMMUNIST AND PRO-COMMUNIST CONGRESSMEN TOOK TURNS LAMBASTING WILEY, THE UNITED STATES, PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S ADMINISTRATION, AND U.S. BUSINESS INTERESTS IN GUATEMALA DURING A NIGHT SESSION THAT LASTED UNTIL THE EARLY HOURS OF TODAY.

ER214P 2-2